

School Improvement Grants Application

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: XX/XX/2010

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. [OMB approval forthcoming]

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (SIG)

Legal Name of Applicant:	Applicant's Mailing Address:
<div>LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant</div> <div>Name: .</div> <div>Position and Office:</div> <div>Contact's Mailing Address:</div> <div>Telephone:</div> <div>Fax:</div> <div>Email address:</div>	
LEA Superintendent or Charter School Director (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the LEA Superintendent or Charter School Director X_____	Date:
The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the LEA receives through this application.	

STATE OF UTAH SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT 2010 LEA APPLICATION: REQUIREMENTS

Utah Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools:

Tier I Schools:

- Title I Served School;
- Identified in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring under Title I; and
- Lowest 5% or 5 Schools, whichever is greater (in Utah - lowest 5 schools). Utah has no Title I high schools identified as in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring. Thus, no Title I secondary schools with a graduation rate less than 60% are included in Tier I.

Tier I Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) Elementary School;
- 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency (2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10) in lowest quintile [for Utah: equal to or lower than the lowest performing school in Tier 1 (Dual Immersion at 42% proficiency)]; and
- Not making expected progress (At least 180 on Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (UPASS) Progress Score – 3-year average from years 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10). The state of Utah did not weight “all student” group compared with subgroups.

Tier II Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) Secondary School:
 - Lowest 5% or 5 Schools, whichever is greater (in Utah - lowest 5% schools equals seven (7) schools);
 - OR
 - Less than 60% graduation rate (Utah has no high schools identified as Tier II solely as a result of a graduation rate of less than 60%). Utah uses a cohort graduation rate for this definition.

Tier II Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) Secondary School:
 - 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency in lowest quintile [for Utah: equal to or lower than the lowest performing school in Tier I (Dual Immersion Academy at 42% proficiency)];
 - Not making expected progress (Utah measure of expected progress is a score of at least 180 on UPASS Progress Score – 3-year average);
 - OR
 - Graduation Rate less than 60%.

Tier III Schools:

- Title I Served School; and

- Identified in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring under Title I, but not in Tier I.

Tier III Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) elementary school;
- 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency in lowest quintile [for Utah: Higher than lowest Tier I school (Dual Immersion Academy at 42% proficiency) and equal to or lower than the highest performing school in Tier I (Oquirrh Hills Elementary at 64% proficiency)]; and
- Not making expected progress (At least 180 on UPASS Progress Score – 3-year average).
- Schools included on Tier III list that were excluded due to an n size < 40.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA's application for a School Improvement Grant.

PART 1

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The state of Utah requires that any LEA making application for the School Improvement Grants 1003g must analyze the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school for which it applies that appears on the state's

identified Tier I and Tier II list. Included in the analysis of each school, the LEA should consider the following:

- The percent of students scoring proficient for Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider overall school and subgroup achievement);
- Trend data for both Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider overall school and subgroup achievement);
- Demographic information relevant to the school's achievement in Language Arts and Mathematics;
- Contextual data of the school (attendance, graduation and dropout rates, discipline reports, parent and community surveys);
- Teacher information (teacher attendance, turnover rates, teaching assignments aligned with highly qualified teacher status, teacher education, experience, and performance evaluations);
- Administrator information (how long the administrator has been at the building, or the replacement of the principal as required in the Turnaround or Transformation models, administrator education, experience, and performance evaluation); and
- Effectiveness of prior school reform efforts.

Based on the analysis of the above data:

- Identify the intervention model chosen for each school; and
- Provide the rationale for the model chosen for each school.

In reviewing LEA SIG applications, the USOE will use the following criteria to identify approvable applications in the area of LEA analysis of Tier I and Tier II schools to determine appropriate intervention model. Only those LEA SIG applications that have a proficient analysis will be considered.

Inadequate analysis:

- **Little to no** relevant data or few relevant data sources have been provided and/or the analysis is lacking or minimal.
- The fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen is **lacking, minimal, or general** in nature.

Proficient analysis:

- **Multiple** relevant data sources have been combined into a thoughtful analysis.
- The fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen is **specifically and conclusively** demonstrated.

- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

The LEA has identified how it will provide leadership and support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEAs application. The description will include the following information on how the LEA will successfully implement the school intervention model:

- Identify the LEA staff assigned to support implementation of the school intervention model;
- Describe how the LEA will provide technical assistance to make sure each school is successful;
- Identify the fiscal resources (state and federal) that the LEA will commit to implementation;
- Identify the process through which the LEA will involve the school/community;
- Describe how the local school board will be engaged to ensure successful implementation (including the prioritization or revision of appropriate board policies and allocation of resources);
- Describe how the LEA will evaluate the effectiveness of the reform strategies;
- Describe how the LEA will monitor student achievement by individual teacher/classrooms; and
- If student achievement results do not meet expected goals, describe how the LEA will assist in necessary plan revisions.

In reviewing LEA SIG applications, the USOE will use the following criteria to identify approvable applications in the area of demonstrating the LEA capacity to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model. Only those LEA SIG applications that have a proficient demonstrated capacity will be considered.

Inadequate demonstrated capacity:

- None, few, some, or most of the defined capacity criteria relevant to the school's selected intervention model have been adequately addressed.

Proficient demonstrated capacity:

- **All** of the defined capacity criteria relevant to the school's selected intervention model have been adequately addressed.
- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

The LEA budget included in the SIG application demonstrates that the LEA has allocated a reasonable amount for LEA support and school intervention model strategies. Quality budgets include the following:

- The LEA provides a budget for each of the three years of the grant;
- For each school included in the SIG application, the budget provides reasonable costs associated with the successful implementation of the intervention model selected (e.g. extended learning time, professional development, teacher recruitment and retention);
- If the LEA plans to apply for SIG funds to support LEA efforts, the budget includes adequate and reasonable costs associated with LEA leadership and support of the school intervention models;
- The LEA budget includes reasonable costs for purchased professional services to ensure quality consultants to facilitate research-based reform;
- The budget detail provides sufficient information to support budget requests; and
- The LEA has considered any costs associated with program evaluation.

PART 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant.

In reviewing the LEA applications, the SEA will use a detailed checklist based on the information requested in Part 2 of the application to determine LEA commitment to implementing SIG requirements.

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

The LEA must include in its SIG application information that describes how it will implement with fidelity each of the requirements associated with the intervention model(s) selected for its eligible schools. This information includes the following:

- Identification of the school(s) for which the LEA is making application;
- Identification of the intervention model for each participating school;
- Sufficient information describing how the LEA will successfully implement each requirement;
- Any steps already taken by the LEA to initiate school improvement efforts that align with SIG intervention models; and
- The LEA includes a timeline for implementation of the school intervention model.

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

The LEA must include in its SIG application sufficient information describing how it will select and contract with proven external providers to support the LEA and the school(s) in the implementation of the intervention model(s). This includes the following:

- The LEA will declare whether it intends to contract with an external provider.
 - Chooses to contract with external providers:
 - A description of how the LEA will contract with an external provider, including a description of how the LEA will recruit, screen, and select external providers;
 - If the LEA has already selected an external provider, the LEA must provide evidence that the external provider has a demonstrated record of success and the expected services that the contractor will provide; and
 - A narrative description and budget to support external provider contracts, if applicable.
 - The LEA must assure that a school appraisal will be conducted using the USOE Title I System of Support Handbook tools. This appraisal must be conducted by an experienced School Support Team leader who is external to the LEA. A list of approved School Support Team Leaders can be found at <https://usoe.edgateway.net/cs/sst/print/htdocs/sst/home.htm>
 - Chooses not to contract with external providers:
 - If the LEA has chosen not to contract with an external provider, the LEA must provide documentation that it has sufficient internal capacity to conduct a

research-based school appraisal using the USOE Title I System of Support Handbook tools. This appraisal must be conducted in conjunction with an experienced School Support Team Leader who is external to the LEA. The SST Leader will assist the school in the implementation of the intervention model. A list of approved School Support Team Leaders can be found at <https://usoe.edgateway.net/cs/sst/print/htdocs/sst/home.htm>.

In reviewing LEA SIG applications, the USOE will evaluate the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable. USOE will use the following criteria to identify approvable applications in the area of external provider selection process should an LEA choose to use an external provider:

- Detailed and relevant criteria for determining need for external provider contract and selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the Tier I and/or Tier II schools to be served by external providers. These criteria may include, but are not limited to:
 - Analysis of the LEA's capacity and operational needs.
 - Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school.
 - Consider and analyze the external provider market.
 - Contact other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience.
 - A proven track record of success working with a particular population or type of school. For example, success in working with high schools or English Language Learners.
 - Alignment between external provider services and existing LEA services.
 - Delineating clearly the respective responsibilities and expectations to be assumed by the external provider and the LEA.
 - Willingness of the external provider to be held accountable to high performance standards.
 - Capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school and its selected intervention model.
- LEA provides a description of the reasonable and timely steps it will take to recruit and screen providers to be in place by the beginning of the 2011-12 school year.

Inadequate demonstrated capacity:

- The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are **not defined, minimally, or generally** aligned.
- Available providers have **not been or only generally researched**.
- The identified external provider **does not have a proven track record, this has not been addressed**, or the **track record does not align with the needs of the school**.
- The LEA has **not specifically indicated how** it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards.
- The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has **not been clearly addressed**.
- The LEA has not provided a clear and reasonable timeline to recruit, screen, and contract with an external provider as appropriate.

Proficient demonstrated capacity:

- The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are **clearly defined** and aligned.
- Available providers have been **thoroughly** researched.
- The provider identified has a proven track record of success in working with **similar schools and/or student populations**.
- The LEA has **specifically** planned how it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards.
- The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been **clearly demonstrated**.
- The LEA has provided a clear and reasonable timeline to recruit, screen, and contract with an external provider as appropriate.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions in the budget detail section of the application.

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has committed appropriate other state and federal resources to support successful implementation of the intervention model. A competitive LEA SIG application must include the following information:

- A description of how LEA program personnel will collaborate to support student achievement and school reform;
- A list of the financial resources that will support the intervention model (e.g. local, state, federal funds, and other private grants, as appropriate); and
- A description of how each of the financial resources listed above will support the goals of the school reform effort.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has identified potential practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation of intervention strategies. Competitive applications include the following:

- A list of practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation;
- Proposed steps to modify identified practices and/or policies to minimize barriers;
- A procedure in place to identify and resolve future issues related to practices and/or policies; and
- Description of how the LEA will collaborate with key stakeholders to implement necessary changes (e.g. associations, administrators, local board of education).

In reviewing LEA SIG applications, the USOE will evaluate the LEA's commitment to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively. Only those LEA SIG applications that have a proficient description of how the LEA identifies potential barriers and how it addresses them will be considered. USOE will use the following criteria to identify approvable applications:

Inadequate LEA commitment to modify its practices and policies:

- The barriers to successful implementation of interventions are **not defined, minimally, or generally** defined.

- The plan to address the identified barriers is **not clearly defined**.
- The LEA description **does not demonstrate** sufficient commitment to work with **key stakeholder groups** to modify practices and policies, as necessary.

Proficient LEA commitment to modify its practices and policies:

- The barriers to successful implementation of interventions are **clearly defined**.
- The plan to address the identified barriers is **clearly defined**.
- The LEA description **demonstrates** sufficient commitment to work with **key stakeholder groups** to modify practices and policies, as necessary.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has a reasonable plan to sustain the improvements achieved through the SIG process when the funding period ends. Competitive applications include the following:

- A list of the ongoing supports needed to sustain school improvement after the funding period ends;
- A description of the anticipated resources that will be committed to meet the needs identified above; and
- The written assurance of the superintendent/charter school leader and the local school board that continued support will be provided.

(6) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application.

(7) The LEA must describe the annual goals (Goals must be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-based (SMART) for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.

(8) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.

(9) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

(10) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

NOTE: The amount of funds applied for must include a planned budget for each year of the three years of the grant. The yearly SIG funds requested must be a minimum of \$50,000 per year for each school served and must not exceed \$2,000,000 per year per school for each school served.

The LEA must provide a **three-year budget** that demonstrates the LEA has allocated a reasonable amount for LEA support and school intervention model strategies. Quality budgets include the following:

- Adequate resources to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Adequate and reasonable costs associated with LEA leadership and support of the school intervention models for the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools;
- If applicable, the LEA has included adequate and reasonable costs associated with approvable pre-implementation activities;
 - All pre-implementation strategies and activities must have prior approval from the SEA and use the funds in accordance with Title I allowable expenditures. These activities must be reasonable and necessary for the full implementation of the grant in the 2011-12 school year (e.g. extended learning time, professional development, teacher recruitment and retention);
- School improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application;
 - Reasonable costs associated with the successful implementation of the intervention model selected at each school (e.g. extended learning time, professional development, teacher recruitment and retention);
 - Reasonable costs for purchased professional services to ensure quality consultants to facilitate research-based reform;
- Budget details provide sufficient information to support budget requests; and
- The LEA has considered any costs associated with program evaluation.

Note: An LEA's budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- ☐ Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- ☐ Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;

- ☐ If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- ☐ Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

USOE has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.

- ☐ “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.